

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 18. Applicants have amended claim 2. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10-15 and 18 are presently pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following arguments.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Applicants have amended claim 2 to more particularly recite the body of the suspension does “not extend[] through said aperture” in the bracket of the frame that receives the first guide member. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification and drawings including in Figures 1-6. Applicants submit that the amendment does not add any new matter.

III. CLAIM FEES

Applicants paid for three independent claims with the basic filing fee at the time the application as filed. On June 6, 2006, Applicants filed a reply including amendments to the claims. Following the amendments to the claims, the application contained six independent claims. A fee worksheet dated June 8, 2006 in the image file wrapper and prepared by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, however, erroneously indicates that the application continued to include only three independent claims following the filing of the amendments. Based on this worksheet and a review of records of the Deposit Account of counsel for Applicants, it appears that the fees for the three additional

independent claims were never deducted from the Deposit Account. Accordingly, Applicants are again submitting the additional fees with the filing of this Reply.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Petit (U.S. Patent No. 6,607,206). Applicants have amended claim 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome because Petit does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in the claim as amended. In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”).

Independent claim 2, as amended, recites a “suspension” including “a body coupled to an axle beam...a first arm extending from said body....a first guide member connected to said body and received within an aperture defined by a bracket of said frame, said body not extending through said aperture“ and “a spring disposed between said axle beam and said frame and supported by a spring seat defined by said body.” Applicants respectfully submit that Petit does not disclose or suggest a suspension meeting the above-recited limitations.

The Examiner has equated different parts of the leaf spring 10 in Petit with the “body,” “first arm,” and “first guide member” recited in claim 2. In particular, the Examiner notes that the “central and rearward portions of leaf #10 located near #20 and rearward of #20” may comprise the “body”, the “forward portion of leaf #13” may

comprise the “first arm” and the “rearward ends of leaf spring that extend through aperture in bracket” may comprise the “guide member.”

As set forth in the claim, the body must be “coupled to the axle beam,” “define[] a spring seat” to support the spring and “not extend[] through said aperture” in the frame bracket. The section of the leaf spring 20 in Petit identified by the Examiner as correlating to the “body” in claim 2 cannot meet all of these limitations. In particular, the section of the leaf spring 10 identified by the Examiner passes through the bracket 40.

Because Petit does not meet or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent claim 2, as amended, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

V. CONCLUSION

For the above cited reasons, all of the claims presently pending in this application are believed to be allowable. If the Examiner has any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

William F. Kolakowski III
Registration No. 41908
Customer No. 26,127
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
39577 Woodward Ave., Ste. 300
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
(248) 203-0822
Attorney for Applicant

BH01\677198.1
ID\WFK